

Corrections Standards Authority

Youthful Offender Block Grant: Expenditures & Outcomes

First Annual Report to the Legislature

2009~10



Youthful Offender Block Grant

First Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2011

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive Sacramento, CA 95811
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/index.html**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EDMUND G. BROWN JR, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

Matthew L. Cate, Secretary

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

Members

Matthew L. Cate, Chair

Scott Kernan

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

John Ingrassia

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility
San Diego County Sheriff's Department*

Vacant

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program
Delancey Street Foundation, San Francisco*

Ed Prieto

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or less)
County of Yolo*

Michele Minor

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Leroy Baca

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or more)
County of Los Angeles*

Carol Biondi

*Public Member
County of Los Angeles*

Patricia Bates

*County Supervisor
County of Orange*

Eleanor Andrade-Silva

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Linda Penner

*Chief Probation Officer (county over 200,000 pop.)
County of Fresno*

Collene Campbell

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Adele Arnold

*Chief Probation Officer (county under 200,000 pop.)
County of Tuolumne*

Sandra McBrayer

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff*

Kimberly Epps

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Officer*

Charlotte Mello

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Staff

Debbie Rives, Executive Director (A)

CORRECTIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
Marlon Yarber, Deputy Director

STANDARDS AND TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONS DIVISION
Evonne Garner, Deputy Director (A)

FACILITIES STANDARDS AND OPERATIONS DIVISION
Gary Wion, Deputy Director

COUNTY FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION DIVISION
Robert J. Takeshta, Deputy Director

Acknowledgements

CSA would like to acknowledge the tremendous contribution of time and effort made by Lee Britton, Ph.D., Research Manager II for the California Department of Justice. Dr. Britton brought a true spirit of cooperation to this effort and his significant contribution made the collection of performance outcome data, and subsequent development of this report, possible.

CSA would also like to acknowledge the contribution made by Randall Thomas of the Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Enterprise Information Services – Tactical Systems Unit. Mr. Thomas played a critical role in development of the performance outcome reporting form and sampling process which were of critical importance to our data collection effort and, ultimately, the success of this project.

Finally, CSA acknowledges the valuable contribution made by the Executive Steering Committee members (listed on pages 14-15 of this report) who came from all over California to generously give their time and effort to the task of defining an implementation strategy for the Youthful Offender Block Grant program. This diverse and talented committee played an essential role in developing the building blocks that made this report possible.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	4
A Critical Review of SB 81	5
Little Hoover Commission	5
California Research Bureau	7
State Commission on Juvenile Justice	7
Prison Law Office	8
Legislative Analyst’s Office	9
SBX4 13 – Bringing Accountability to YOBG	11
Overview of YOBG Amendments	11
Key Provisions that Did Not Change Under SBX4 13	11
Redefining YOBG	14
Executive Steering Committee Membership	14
Significant Decisions of the ESC	15
Implementing Decisions of the Executive Steering Committee	18
Funding Applications (Juvenile Justice Development Plans)	18
Summary of Actual Expenditure Data	18
Summary of Performance Outcome Data Collection Procedures and Results	22
Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample	22
Assembling the Final Sample	23
Characteristics of Final Sample	23
Development and Field Testing of Data Collection Instrument.....	24
Data Verification	24
Results	25
Reporting Requirements for CSA	34

Appendices

- A – YOBG Statute
- B – YOBG Performance Outcomes Report form
- C – Table of Total Expenditures for Each Category (all funding sources)
- D – Summary of Per Capita Costs
- E – Comparison of County YOBG Allocation Amounts & County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group
- F – Assessments Administered, Services Delivered and Outcomes Achieved

List of Tables

- Table 1 – Summary of YOBG Expenditures
- Table 2 – YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- Table 3 – Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and Other Funding Sources
- Table 4 – Cases Excluded from Initial Target Sample
- Table 5 – Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample
- Table 6 – Assessment Rates
- Table 7 – Placements and Direct Services Rates
- Table 8 – YOBG Funding of Specific Assessments, Placements and Direct Services
- Table 9 – Baseline Characteristics of Final Sample
- Table 10 – Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period
- Table 11 – Outcomes and Risk/Needs Assessment Rates
- Table 12 – Performance Outcomes Relationship with Baseline Characteristics
- Table 13 – Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services

1 Executive Summary

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program was established with enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 81 (Chapter 175) in 2007. The YOBG program commenced on September 1, 2007, realigning about 1,300 lower level offenders within California's juvenile justice population from state to local control. Counties have been deemed better suited to provide services to this population based on the premise that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders in the proximity of their families and communities.

In recognition of the increased county responsibility for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through YOBG. The proportion of YOBG funds allocated to each county is based on a statutorily defined formula that gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population and the number of juvenile felony dispositions. The program reached its full funding level of \$93.3 million in 2009-10 and the annual statewide allocation will remain at that level in future years.

Following enactment of SB 81, numerous entities published reports pointing to a variety of shortcomings in the law. In response to those concerns, on July 28, 2009, the Governor signed Senate Bill 13 of Extraordinary Session 4 (SBX4 13), making significant changes to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program. Most notably, SBX4 13 builds accountability into the system by requiring annual YOBG Funding Applications as well as annual reporting of Actual Expenditures and Performance Outcomes. Annual reporting requires counties to more carefully monitor their YOBG expenditures and programs in order to report on them at the conclusion of each year. Similarly, it requires the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) to more closely monitor, track and assess county expenditures and outcomes in order to report to the Legislature. The first set of expenditure and outcome reports were due from counties on October 1, 2010; they form the basis for this first annual report to the Legislature.

Actual Expenditures

Counties reported spending a total of \$86.6 million in YOBG funds during 09/10. Because counties are not required to spend YOBG funds in the year allocated, \$74.4 million of these expenditures were from the 09/10 allocation, with the remaining \$12.2 million coming from prior year allocations. A total of \$18.9 million in 2009-10 YOBG funds remain to be expended.

YOBG expenditures funded, in whole or in part, Placements, Direct Services and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities that directly or indirectly served a total of 38,659 youth, at an overall per capita cost of \$2,239. For every \$1 spent in YOBG funds, counties reported spending an additional \$.40 dollars from other funding sources.

Of the \$86.6 million in YOBG funds spent in 2009-10, 73% went toward Placements, 24% toward Direct Services; and 3% toward Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities.

Performance Outcomes

Counties provided performance outcome information for a representative statewide sample of 1,011 youth with adjudicated felony offenses during fiscal year 2008-09 (i.e., youthful offenders considered likely candidates for DJJ commitment prior to SB 81). Of the 1,011 sample youth, 334 (33%) were reported as receiving one or more YOBG-funded services during the one-year period following their date of disposition of the adjudicated felony offense.

Compared to youth who did not receive any YOBG funded services (667), the YOBG-funded group received significantly more direct services and placements. For those direct services counties provided, in every instance where there was a statistically significant difference, the percentage of youth who received a particular service was higher for YOBG-funded youth compared with non YOBG-funded youth.

Furthermore, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school or graduated from high school during the one year follow-up period. Although a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth also received a new felony adjudication in juvenile court, a significantly lower percentage of YOBG-funded youth received a felony conviction in adult court.

The data also show a difference in the assessment rate for the YOBG-funded group compared with youth who did not receive YOBG-funded services. Across the various assessment types, youth who received YOBG-funded services were more likely to also receive one or more assessments. Among all youth who received a risk and/or needs assessment, irrespective of funding source, 94.0% were also enrolled in school during the year. Of those who did not receive a risk and/or needs assessment, only 80.3% were enrolled in school. Alternatively, of those who received an assessment, 16.7% received a new felony adjudication, while only 5.8% of those who did not receive an assessment received a new felony adjudication.

Analysis of data regarding the number of direct services received by youth and the outcomes achieved by those youth – irrespective of funding source – show mixed results. In looking at whether youth were enrolled in school at any time during the 2008-09 year, the number of direct services received by youth has a positive relationship with the rate of school enrollment. Alternatively, in looking at whether youth in the sample received a new felony adjudication, it is seen that the receipt of more services by youth corresponds to a higher incidence of new felony adjudications.

Conclusion

A comparison of youth who received YOBG-funded services during 2008-09 with youth who did not, suggests that the infusion of additional funds resulting from enactment of the Youthful Offender Block Grant program has benefited youth in the county juvenile probation system by providing more services, providing more assessments and creating an opportunity for better outcomes.

Beginning in April, 2011, similar data will be collected for a representative sample of youth with adjudicated felonies during fiscal year 2009-10, thereby making it possible to assess trends in YOBG expenditures and outcomes from year-to-year.

2 Background

History of the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program was established with enactment of Senate Bill 81 (Chapter 175) in 2007. The YOBG program commenced on September 1, 2007, realigning a segment of California's juvenile justice population from state to local control. Under this legislation, counties are no longer allowed to send certain lower level offenders to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Youth who are no longer eligible for DJJ commitment are those who commit an offense that is not listed in Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 707(b) and is not a sex offense as set forth in Penal Code Section 290.008(c). Consistent with best practices, counties have been deemed better suited to provide services to this population of juvenile offenders. SB 81 supports the concept that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders in the proximity of their families and communities.

At the time SB 81 was enacted, there were about 700 juvenile offenders within DJJ facilities who would meet the criteria to no longer be eligible for DJJ commitment. Similarly, there were about 600 juvenile offenders on DJJ parole who would meet the criteria. Given these numbers, it was estimated that DJJ's commitments would decrease by about 1,300 youth, and county probation caseloads would increase by about the same number, as a result of SB 81 implementation.

In recognition of the increased county responsibility for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through the YOBG program. The proportion of YOBG funds allocated to each county is based on a statutorily defined formula that gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population and the number of juvenile felony dispositions.

For fiscal year 2007-08, the first year of implementation, counties were given \$22.7 million in YOBG funding. On or before January 1, 2008, counties were required to submit a Juvenile Justice Development Plan (JJDP) to the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) outlining proposed YOBG expenditures for that first year. Per the statute, "allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject [to the provisions of SB 81]." Based on this provision, allowable uses of YOBG funds are very broad. As reflected in the JJDP's, proposed uses of YOBG funds vary significantly, reflecting the broad differences in California's counties and highlighting local priorities. To guide counties in appropriate use of YOBG funds, the Legislature identified several key components counties could employ to

positively and effectively impact the lives of juveniles who remain under their supervision per SB 81. Those key components include:

- Adequate risk and needs assessments;
- The ability to utilize a multitude of graduated sanctions from treatment to intensive supervision and detention;
- Re-entry and aftercare programs;
- Agency capacity building; and
- The formation or expansion of regional networks.

For the second year of implementation, fiscal year 2008-09, counties received \$66.2 million in YOBG funding. There were no reporting requirements during the second year. Similarly, there was no defined role for CSA during the second year. Counties all received a lump sum allocation from the State Controller's Office and were independently responsible for utilizing those funds in a manner consistent with the YOBG statute, which is included as Appendix A.

In fiscal year 2009-10, the YOBG program reached full implementation, with funding at \$93.3 million. As had been the case during the second year, for 2009-10, SB 81 provided county financial support without mandating a funding application or any reporting.

A Critical Review of SB 81

Enactment of SB 81 resulted in a huge policy change by shifting responsibility for many juvenile offenders from state to local jurisdictions. Given the significance of this change, there was tremendous interest in the new law and its resulting impact. Consequently, several entities published reports regarding SB 81. What follows are very brief overviews of these reports.

Little Hoover Commission Juvenile Justice Reform: Realigning Responsibilities July 2008¹

In considering the realignment enacted by SB 81, the Little Hoover Commission made the following, general findings:

- Although the state is giving an increasing portion of its juvenile justice budget to counties, it is not providing leadership or oversight to ensure the money is spent well or that outcomes are monitored or measured.
- The state must plan to take the process of realignment to its logical conclusion and turn supervision of all juvenile offenders over to counties.
- The state should streamline state-level juvenile justice functions and consolidate resources into a small but focused "Office of Juvenile Justice" within the

¹ The Little Hoover report, "Juvenile Justice Reform: Realigning Responsibilities," can be accessed at <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/studies/192/report192.html>.

Governor's Office. This should be accomplished by redirecting resources currently in various juvenile justice-related entities within CDCR.

- It is unrealistic to believe that juvenile justice will get the attention it requires as long as the function remains within the adult correctional system.

The Little Hoover Commission's report identified several specific shortcomings of realignment:

- Supplantation of funds is allowed;
- Juvenile Justice Development Plans were only required once;
- There are no outcomes expected or reported;
- State-level grant accountability is diluted (separate roles for CSA, the State Controller's Office and the Department of Finance);
- SB 81 added another separate funding stream;
- The state has little control over whether realignment money is used efficiently or effectively; and
- There is no assurance that realignment funds will be applied to filling identified gaps in local juvenile offender programs.

The Little Hoover Commission's report also included the following recommendations:

1. To improve public safety and provide statewide leadership on juvenile justice policy, the governor and Legislature must consolidate programs and services into a streamlined Governor's Office of Juvenile Justice outside of the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, to develop a strategy for a comprehensive, statewide juvenile justice system that includes a complete and consistent continuum of evidence-based services for youth and to oversee county programs funded by state General Fund allocations.
2. To ensure the success of juvenile justice realignment, the governor and Legislature must bolster the accountability and oversight of the Youthful Offender Block Grant by consolidating it with the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act funding and the Juvenile Probation and Camps Funding program into one dedicated funding stream for local juvenile justice programs and services.
3. The governor and Legislature should extend the sunset of the State Commission on Juvenile Justice until January 2010 and charge it with assisting counties in implementing the recommendations in its master plan and providing oversight of the realignment process.
4. The state should eliminate its juvenile justice operations by 2011.

**California Research Bureau
County Probation Camps and Ranches for Juvenile Offenders
November 2008²**

Upon request of Assembly Member Jose Solario (then-Chair of the Public Safety Committee) the California Research Bureau (CRB) examined California's county camps and ranches for juvenile offenders in the context of juvenile justice system reforms implemented as a result of SB 81. The CRB report points out that counties are not required to develop outcome indicators that can measure the effectiveness of intervention programs and also notes that counties are far from maximizing opportunities to pool their resources to address the growing program needs of juvenile offenders. While the report stops short of making recommendations, it does identify several options for legislative action, including:

1. The Legislature could direct CSA to require that state grants to county probation departments require an analysis of the feasibility of forming regional collaborations or multi-county consortiums in order to provide a full array of aftercare services for juveniles leaving county camps and ranches.
2. The Legislature could require CSA to direct existing grant funding to county pilot projects based on the Missouri model.
3. The Legislature could require the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR) or its Division of Juvenile Justice to develop useful and accurate outcome data for counties to monitor the performance of their programs.
4. The Legislature could require CDCR or its Division of Juvenile Justice to convene a taskforce of county officials to analyze what data they need to collect and how, how much it would cost, and which entities should be responsible for collecting, evaluating, and publishing the information.

**State Commission on Juvenile Justice
Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan: Blueprint for an Outcome
Oriented Juvenile Justice System
January 2009³**

As part of SB 81, the State Commission on Juvenile Justice was re-constituted and directed to develop a Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan by January 1, 2009. In its Operational Master Plan, the Commission made the following major recommendations:

² The California Research Bureau report, "County Probation Camps and Ranches," can be accessed at [http:// www.library.ca.gov/crb/08/08-016.pdf](http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/08/08-016.pdf).

³ The State Commission on Juvenile Justice report, "Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan: Blueprint for an Outcome Oriented Juvenile Justice System," can be accessed at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/State_Commission_on_Juvenile_Justice/Reports.html.

- Create an “outcome oriented Juvenile Justice System”
- Create an independent California Board of Juvenile Justice as a policy and oversight board responsible for administering state and local juvenile justice grants
- Consolidate state funds into an annual and stable general fund allocation

The implementation strategies discussed in the report focus on the use of validated risk and needs assessment tools, universal data collection elements and evidence-based programs. The following “solution” is taken from the Executive Summary.

Every county (and DJJ) needs:

- A consistently reliable way to measure a youth’s risk of reoffense and to assess factors (sometimes called “criminogenic needs”) that contribute to his or her criminal conduct as well as a consistently reliable way to measure a youth’s strengths and protective factors,
- An inventory of evidence-based interventions that effectively address common criminogenic needs and build on the strengths and protective factors youths bring to the process,
- A case management system that matches medium and high risk youth to the appropriate interventions,
- A data system that captures the data elements needed to assess outcomes, and
- Stable funding to make it work.

In addition, there is a statewide need for:

- A data reporting and analysis system that measures intermediate and long term outcomes to determine what is working, what needs fixing, and what needs replacing,
- A quality assurance process to ensure that all parts are operating as they should,
- A system of incentives that ties funding to outcomes, and
- Technical assistance to the counties.

Prison Law Office
Juvenile Justice at a Crossroads: The Future of Senate Bill 81 in California
January 2009⁴

Although the report states that comprehensive system enhancements – made possible by the availability of YOBG funds – will undoubtedly improve counties’ chances to successfully support youth locally and prevent further system penetration, the Prison Law Office (PLO) finds several faults with SB 81, including the following:

- In general, the law fails to institute: adequate mechanisms for tracking YOBG expenditures and overall effects of the realignment; technical assistance to support local implementation; clear standards for SB 81 funding expenditures;

⁴ The Prison Law Office report, “Juvenile Justice at a Crossroads: The Future of Senate Bill 81 in California,” can be accessed at <http://www.prisonlaw.com/pdfs/SB81report.pdf>.

guidelines for county planning processes; and accountability for SB 81 expenditures, such as tracking of outcomes.

- The state's provision of leadership, structure and oversight for the process is essential to successful county implementation of the realignment. SB 81 fails to designate a single state entity for this purpose.
- The law does not require counties to engage in any systematic evaluation process for identifying YOBG expenditures, lacks coherent standards for YOBG expenditures, and fails to require counties to demonstrate the use of local data to support their selection of new or enhanced programs or services.
- The law does not include an anti-supplantation clause.

In its report, the PLO identified recommendations for both the State and counties. Those recommendations are listed below.

Through a single designated state authority, the State should:

1. Require annual Juvenile Justice Development Plans;
2. Require multi-agency YOBG planning;
3. Require unused DJJ commitment fees to stay in local juvenile justice;
4. Perform qualitative evaluation of YOBG expenditures;
5. Require local tracking and reporting of outcome measures;
6. Monitor YOBG expenditures;
7. Track residual effects of the realignment; and
8. Provide technical assistance to counties.

And, the counties should:

1. Expand reliance on community-based sanctions;
2. Increase availability of intermediate interventions;
3. Develop alternatives to commitments in juvenile detention centers and out-of-state facilities;
4. Focus on specialized treatment facilities;
5. Invest in support services for realigned DJJ youth; and
6. Provide adequate services for girls.

**Legislative Analyst's Office
Criminal Justice Realignment
January 2009⁵**

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) prepared this report as part of its 2009-10 Budget Analysis Series. In its report, the LAO expressed support of the juvenile justice realignment concept enacted by SB 81 but went on to suggest that maximum benefit and efficiency would only come from expanding the idea further. Specifically, the LAO recommended shifting full programmatic and financial responsibility for juvenile

⁵ The Legislative Analyst's Office report, "Criminal Justice Realignment," can be accessed at <http://www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/PubDetails.aspx?id=1913>.

offenders to counties. In turn, it recommended counties be given additional funding to serve these offenders along with broad flexibility to determine spending and program priorities.

Conclusion

As seen above, many of the same concerns about SB 81 were shared by multiple entities. In response to those concerns, on July 28, 2009, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 13 of Extraordinary Session 4 (SBX4 13), making significant changes to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program. Most notably, SBX4 13 builds accountability into the system by requiring annual YOBG Funding Applications (Juvenile Justice Development Plans) as well as annual reporting of actual expenditures and performance outcomes. This requires counties to more carefully monitor their YOBG expenditures and programs in order to report on them at the conclusion of each year. Similarly, it requires CSA to more closely monitor, track and assess county expenditures and outcomes. The annual reporting now required allows any interested party to obtain information regarding the nature of YOBG expenditures as well as the performance outcomes for youth who have been impacted by juvenile justice realignment.

3 SBX4 13 – Bringing Accountability to YOBG

Overview of YOBG Amendments

The enactment of SBX4 13 brought a comprehensive process for reporting and oversight of YOBG funds. That process is as follows:

By May 1st of each year, counties must submit annual Funding Applications containing their proposed expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. These Funding Applications are also referred to as Juvenile Justice Development Plans.

By October 1st of each year, counties must submit a report of actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year. Also by October 1st of each year, counties must report on performance outcomes for the previous fiscal year.

By March 15th of each year, based on the October reports received from counties, the Corrections Standards Authority must prepare and submit to the Legislature a report summarizing county utilization of block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including a summary of performance outcomes. CSA must also post an annual summary of county reports on its website; however, the due date for this posting is not specified in law.

In addition to the changes noted above, SBX4 13 made other important changes to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program, including:

- County allocations are now released in four quarterly installments rather than one lump sum. The law specifies that the first allocation is to be released in September of each year.
- CSA was responsible for developing and providing counties with a format for the application due on May 1st as well as a format for the reports due on October 1st. For the applications due on May 1st, CSA was authorized by SBX4 13 to consider a dual format that would allow counties to simultaneously address YOBG and the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA).

Key Provisions that Did Not Change Under SBX4 13

YOBG is formula-driven, not competitive: Every county is included in the YOBG program and receives an allocation. There is no competitive aspect to YOBG; each county's allocation is simply based on the formula prescribed in statute. That formula gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population as well as its juvenile felony dispositions. The DOF calculates each county's allocation amount annually using their own demographic information for the juvenile population, which is derived from national census data, and using Department of Justice data for juvenile felony dispositions. While the formula was generally constructed to give counties \$117,000 per YOBG

eligible youth, there is no tangible tie to youth who previously would have gone to DJJ since that population is unidentifiable. Furthermore, each county receives a minimum annual allocation of \$117,000, regardless of what the formula yields.

Broad flexibility: As provided by statute, “allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject [to the provisions of SB 81].”

There is no other provision that addresses eligible uses of YOBG funds. Consequently, counties have tremendous flexibility in how they use YOBG funds and counties have used this flexibility to tailor YOBG-funded programs to fit local needs and priorities.

No Anti-Supplantation Clause: Consistent with the intent to give counties broad flexibility to manage the realigned population in the way they determine to be most appropriate, the YOBG statute does not contain language prohibiting supplantation of funds. Despite the numerous reports citing this as a concern in the original legislation, SBX4 13 did not add anti-supplantation language. Given the timing of YOBG implementation, and the concurrent reduction of other county funding sources, some counties have chosen to use YOBG funds to offset cuts elsewhere in their budgets.

Department of Finance & State Controller’s Office roles: As specified in statute, the Department of Finance (DOF) is responsible for calculating the annual amount of YOBG funding to be allocated to each county. DOF performs this calculation each year following enactment of the State budget. In turn, the State Controller’s Office (SCO) is responsible for remitting the quarterly allocation amounts to each county according to the calculation provided by the DOF. Consequently, CSA, which is responsible for program administration and oversight for this program, is not the fiduciary agent.

CSA Oversight/Monitoring: Despite the new reporting requirements introduced by SBX4 13, CSA has never received any funding for administration of the YOBG program. As a result, no systematic monitoring has occurred, nor is any planned. Should CSA identify a need or receive an inquiry regarding county use of YOBG funds, monitoring would be scheduled in response.

Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1962(b) provides that “The Corrections Standards Authority may monitor and inspect any programs or facilities supported by block grant funds ... and may enforce violations of grant requirements with suspensions or cancellations of grant funds.” While this provision seems to provide a degree of accountability, the “grant requirements” for YOBG are so broad it is possible for counties to make an argument for funding almost anything that is part of their juvenile justice programs. The lack of anti-supplantation language in the statute further supports this county flexibility.

No Requirement for EBP: Despite the current emphasis on Evidence Based Programs and Practices (EBP), there is no requirement that YOBG funds be used to support EBP. The Executive Steering Committee considered whether it would be appropriate to encourage the use of EBP through the application or reporting processes but ultimately decided that absent a statutory requirement in this regard, it would be inappropriate to do so. Even without a requirement, or encouragement, many counties have opted to utilize YOBG funds for implementation and/or maintenance of EBP. For example, numerous counties mention the use of Aggression Replacement Therapy as part of their programming.

4 Redefining YOBG

Executive Steering Committee Membership

Given the magnitude of change to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program, CSA felt it was imperative to convene an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) that would guide the decision making process around implementation of the YOBG amendments.

Accordingly, at the September 10, 2009 meeting of the CSA Board, staff recommended establishing an ESC in order to gather valuable stakeholder input to guide the design and development of forms and processes necessary to implement the statutory changes to YOBG. The Board appointed three of its members as chairs for the ESC and authorized CSA staff to work with the tri-chairs in assembling a full ESC. The tri-chairs appointed by the CSA Board were:

CAROL BIONDI, Member, Los Angeles County Commission for Children & Families

KIMBERLY EPPS, San Bernardino County Supervising Probation Officer

LINDA PENNER, Fresno County Chief Probation Officer

CSA Staff worked with the tri-chairs in selecting the remaining members of the ESC, making every effort to provide a broad geographical representation, as well as a broad representation of juvenile justice-related disciplines. Specifically, the decision was made to include a small, medium and large county, as well as probation, mental health, juvenile justice/advocacy, community based organizations and research. The following members served on the YOBG Executive Steering Committee along with the tri-chairs:

ROBERT BENDORF, Yuba County Administrative Officer

MARY BUTLER, Napa County Chief Probation Officer

DENISE HERZ, Ph.D., Professor, School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics, California State University – Los Angeles

ANGELA IRVINE, Ph.D., Principal, Ceres Policy Research

CHRISTINE ODOM, Sutter County Chief Probation Officer

MAUREEN PACHECO, Juvenile Justice Legislative & Policy Advisor, Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office⁶

JERRY POWERS, Stanislaus County Chief Probation Officer

HEMAL SHARIFZADA, Conference & Training Coordinator, California Youth Connections

⁶ The title shown was current as of the ESC meetings; however, Ms. Pacheco is currently the Assistant Director of the Center for Juvenile Law & Policy at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles.

ELEANOR SILVA, Youth Authority Administrator, Case Services, Division of Juvenile Justice

DAVID STEINHART, Director, Commonweal Juvenile Justice Program

BEVERLY TAYLOR, Deputy Chief Probation Officer, Santa Barbara County

SANDY TERRANOVA, MA, Executive Director, California Family Counseling Center, Phillips Graduate Institute

BERNARD WARNER, Chief Deputy Secretary, Division of Juvenile Justice⁷

Significant Decisions of the ESC

October 2009: The first ESC meeting was held on October 21, 2009. It was in Sacramento at CSA Headquarters and a quorum was present. Significant decisions from this meeting included:

1. Following an overview of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act data collection and reporting system, it was acknowledged that while JJCPA is program-driven, YOBG is offender-driven. As a result, it was decided that a dual reporting process for YOBG and JJCPA would not be possible.
2. Because YOBG funds do not have to be used to support programs, but rather can be used to support any number of probation-related activities, the ESC determined that it was infeasible to collect YOBG-related outcome data on programs. In turn, it was decided that it would be necessary to use the authority in Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1961(e) to modify the performance measures specified in the YOBG statute (WIC 1961(c)(2)).
3. The ESC decided its next step would be to explore options for collecting data on individuals rather than programs.
4. Given the shift in focus from programs to offenders, the ESC discussed possible comparison groups. CSA staff met with research staff from the Division of Juvenile Justice twice to assess the possibility of using a pre-SB 81 DJJ cohort as a comparison group. Ultimately, it was determined that there would be no comparison group available.

November 2009: The second ESC meeting was held on November 20, 2009 and was conducted via teleconference. A quorum was present. Key decisions from this meeting included:

1. To assist CSA in identifying options for YOBG performance measures, a sub-group was formed consisting of Carol Biondi, David Steinhart, Angela Irvine, Denise Herz, Jerry Powers, and Maureen Pacheco.

⁷ The title shown was current as of the ESC meetings; however, Mr. Warner is currently the Director of Prisons for the Washington State Department of Corrections.

2. The group formulated the following questions for the sub-group to consider: On whom can YOBG funds be spent? Is the goal of YOBG simply to serve the realigned population or is it broader than that? Should the performance measures capture outcomes for the realigned population or for anyone receiving services that are funded through YOBG?

December 2009: The Performance Measures Sub-group met on December 16, 2009. This meeting was held in Sacramento at CSA Headquarters. The full sub-group was in attendance. The focus for this meeting was on developing an approach for collection of offender data that would give the State an overview of outcomes for YOBG without overburdening counties. After lengthy discussions, it was decided:

1. To capture youth who would have been likely candidates for DJJ commitments prior to SB 81, counties should report on felony adjudicated youth.
2. The Juvenile Court & Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) would be used to pull a random sample of felony adjudicated youth. Given reported concerns about the reliability of JCPSS data, it was decided that its use would be limited to drawing the random sample. No data regarding youth dispositions would be obtained through JCPSS.
3. The statewide random sample should include a minimum of 1,000 youth.
4. The specific outcomes that counties would be required to report on were discussed. The sub-group considered including a wide variety of outcomes but ultimately chose a few measures that focused on the most frequently requested data.
5. The sample of youth should be taken from all youth with an adjudicated felony during fiscal year 2008-09. This methodology would ensure that a full year of follow up data would be available when reporting on services provided and outcomes achieved.

January 2010: The third meeting of the full ESC was held on January 21, 2010. This meeting was held in Sacramento at CSA Headquarters and a quorum was present. The primary focus of this meeting was to present the recommendations of the Performance Outcomes Sub-group to the full ESC. Although there was lengthy discussion regarding the recommendations of the sub-group, after much debate and explanation, the full ESC adopted those recommendations. In addition, the ESC developed a list of assessments, services and outcomes that counties would be asked to provide information on relative to each youth in the random sample.

The ESC also focused attention on the Funding Application and Actual Expenditure reports at this meeting. The group considered many options for the categorization and collection of expenditure data and discussed at length the level of detail that should be required. During this meeting, the ESC reached decisions about what to include in both the Funding Application and the Actual Expenditure reports.

February 2010: The final ESC meeting was held on February 26, 2010 at CSA Headquarters in Sacramento. A quorum was present. During this meeting, CSA staff presented final reporting forms for the Funding Application, Actual Expenditure Report and Performance Outcomes Report. The ESC determined these forms were all consistent with the decisions it had made at its previous meetings and moved to adopt all three. The Funding Application and Actual Expenditure Report forms approved by the ESC are available on the CSA website⁸, while the Performance Outcome Report form is included as Appendix B.

At the February meeting, the ESC also reviewed the YOBG statute and determined there is no requirement for counties to submit County Supervisor Board of Resolutions as part of their YOBG Funding Applications.

⁸ The address is <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/CSA/PPP/Grants/YOBG/Index.html>.

5 Implementing Decisions of the Executive Steering Committee

Funding Applications (Juvenile Justice Development Plans)

Although counties had all submitted Juvenile Justice Development Plans for the last half of the 2007-08 fiscal year, there was no such requirement for 2008-09 or 2009-10. Given the new requirements in SBX4 13, by May 1, 2010, each county had to submit a YOBG Funding Application specifying how YOBG funds were proposed to be spent during the 2010-11 fiscal year. All 58 counties complied with this requirement and CSA has complete, approved applications on file for each county. There is tremendous variation in the ways counties plan to use YOBG funds, reflecting the differences in California's counties and the tailored approach developed by each in light of unique demographics and priorities. Although not required by law to do so, CSA posted summary information from the Funding Applications on its website.⁹

Summary of Actual Expenditure Data

On October 1, 2010, the first YOBG actual expenditure reports were due from counties to CSA. All 58 counties complied with this reporting requirement and the expenditure information that follows was extracted from the county reports. While the expenditure information reported below is focused on YOBG expenditures, it should be noted that counties reported total expenditures for those YOBG Expenditure Categories that had multiple funding sources. For example, if a county had an electronic monitoring program funded 50% by YOBG, 25% by JJCPA and 25% by county general fund, the county reported all of those funding sources to CSA in its Actual Expenditure Report. For additional information regarding total funding for all YOBG Expenditure Categories, refer to Appendix C.

The total amount of YOBG funds allocated to counties during fiscal year 2009-10 was \$93,264,624; however, counties are able to spend funds allocated in one fiscal year during subsequent fiscal years and many opted to do so. Consequently, total YOBG expenditures during fiscal year 2009-10 were \$86,570,073. Of those expenditures, \$74,407,862 was from the 2009-10 allocation, while \$11,436,416 was from the 2008-09 allocation and \$725,795 was from the 2007-08 allocation.

Since there were no reporting requirements prior to SBX4 13, CSA can only report on the amounts counties reported spending from prior year allocations but not on how much remains unspent. Now that reporting is required, remaining amounts can be tracked and reported. For 2009-10, of the \$93,264,624 allocated, counties carried forward \$18,856,762, or 20%, for use in future fiscal years.

⁹ http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/CSA/PPP/Grants/YOBG/Proposed_YOBG_Expenditures_2010_11.html

CSA collected expenditure information for each of 52 Expenditure Categories. Six of the 52 Expenditure Categories refer to types of Placements, 7 to types of Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities, and the remaining 39 to types of Direct Services.

Table 1 shows total YOBG expenditures for each Expenditure Category, the number of counties who spent YOBG funds in the category, the total number of youth served by these expenditures, and the resultant YOBG per capita cost.¹⁰ Within each of the three major Expenditure Category groupings, individual Expenditure Categories are listed in descending order on the basis of total YOBG expenditures.

Within Placements, Camps accounted for the largest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$30,111,786), was the placement type most frequently funded by YOBG (12 counties), and had the highest YOBG per capita cost (\$16,198).

Within Direct Services, Intensive Probation Supervision accounted for the greatest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$6,027,161), with this service being funded in 15 counties. Next in order of total YOBG funds spent is Day/Evening Treatment Programs (\$3,036,487), followed by Other Direct Service (\$2,764,760) and then Re-Entry or After Care Services (\$2,087,231). Of particular note, the Direct Service most frequently funded by YOBG was Risk and/or Needs Assessment (16 counties) – a practice that is encouraged in the YOBG statute. Family Counseling had the highest YOBG per capita cost (\$10,118), followed closely by Job Readiness Training (\$9,962).

Among Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities, Staff Salaries/Benefits accounted for the greatest amount of YOBG expenditures (\$1,097,788) and also was the activity most frequently funded by YOBG (11 counties). It is also noteworthy that very few YOBG funds were spent on Capital Improvements (\$224,891), Equipment purchases (\$284,832) or other Procurements (\$121,839).

In total, of the \$86.6 million in YOBG funds spent during 2009-10, 73% went toward Placements, 24% toward Direct Services and 3% toward Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities. While a large percentage of YOBG funds were devoted to Placements, it is important to note that these are among the most costly services (see YOBG per capita costs in Table 1). Also, as shown in Table 1, a total 26,977 youth received YOBG-funded Direct Services. This represents 70% of the total 38,659 youth who were served in some capacity by YOBG funding.

¹⁰ No county reported YOBG expenditures for the Expenditure Categories of After School Services, Job Placement, Monetary Incentives, Restitution, Transitional Living Services/Placement and Tutoring.

Table 1 – Summary of YOBG Expenditures

Expenditure Category	Expenditures	# of Counties	Youth Served	Per Capita Cost
Camp	\$30,111,786	12	1859	\$16,198
Home on Probation	\$7,896,109	5	3676	\$2,148
Other Placement	\$7,715,201	3	664	\$11,619
Juvenile Hall	\$7,251,931	11	1140	\$6,361
Other Secure	\$6,744,542	7	814	\$8,286
Ranch	\$3,225,002	5	410	\$7,866
ALL PLACEMENTS	\$62,944,571	43	8563	\$7,351
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$6,027,161	15	2361	\$2,553
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$3,036,487	7	816	\$3,721
Other Direct Service	\$2,764,760	14	3667	\$754
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$2,087,231	8	776	\$2,690
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,514,124	16	12582	\$120
Family Counseling	\$1,001,667	2	99	\$10,118
Individual Mental Health Counseling	\$955,348	11	1542	\$620
Vocational Training	\$929,657	3	246	\$3,779
Mentoring	\$398,251	5	201	\$1,981
Job Readiness Training	\$318,780	1	32	\$9,962
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$266,876	7	833	\$320
Development of Case Plan	\$256,318	2	160	\$1,602
Detention Assessment(s)	\$241,490	1	77	\$3,136
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	\$192,596	4	279	\$690
Functional Family Therapy	\$184,739	3	166	\$1,113
Recreational Activities	\$165,042	3	524	\$315
Gang Intervention	\$111,702	1	56	\$1,995
Electronic Monitoring	\$105,176	8	756	\$139
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$102,624	5	184	\$558
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$80,040	2	288	\$278
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	\$53,222	3	223	\$239
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng./Educ.	\$32,742	5	530	\$62
Special Education Services	\$29,997	1	37	\$811
Community Service	\$21,354	2	65	\$329
Anger Management Counseling	\$17,042	2	180	\$95
Restorative Justice	\$10,433	1	30	\$348
Mental Health Screening	\$10,200	4	173	\$59
Parenting Education	\$2,987	3	83	\$36
Substance Abuse Screening	\$670	1	11	\$61
ALL DIRECT SERVICES	\$20,918,716	140	26,977	\$775
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,097,788	11	562	\$1,953
Other	\$493,485	8	2001	\$247
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$315,242	8	15	\$21,016
Equipment	\$284,832	7	40	\$7,121
Capital Improvements	\$224,891	1	0	N/A
Contract Services	\$168,709	5	251	\$672
Other Procurements	\$121,839	2	250	\$487
ALL CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES	\$2,706,786	42	3119	\$868
ALL PLACEMENTS/SERVICES/ ACTIVITIES	\$86,570,073	225	38,659	\$2,239

For each applicable Expenditure Category, counties were also required to report YOBG expenditures for each of six budget line items. Table 2 summarizes this information and shows that Salaries and Benefits accounted for \$64,946,279, or 75%, of total YOBG expenditures. This is understandable given that both Placements and Direct Services rely heavily on staff for program delivery. Alternatively, it is interesting to note that Administrative Overhead and Fixed Assets/Equipment combined accounted for only 4.4% of total YOBG expenditures¹¹.

Table 2 – YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

Line Item	Expenditures	Percent Total
Salaries & Benefits	\$64,946,279	75.0%
Services & Supplies	\$7,412,578	8.6%
Professional Services.	\$6,685,656	7.7%
Community Based Organizations	\$2,951,852	3.4%
Fixed Assets	\$711,554	0.8%
Administrative Overhead	\$1,322,726	1.5%
Other Costs	\$2,539,428	2.9%
Total	\$86,570,073	

As mentioned previously, for each Expenditure Category funded by YOBG, counties were required to report expenditures from funds received under the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, as well as other funding sources. Table 3 summarizes this information and shows that for all Placements, Direct Services and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities that received YOBG funding, this funding accounted for 71.6% of all spending reported by the counties for these items, with 2.4% of total expenditures coming from JJCPA funds (\$2,946,940) and the remaining 26.0% of total expenditures coming from other funding sources (\$31,409,664). As a percentage of total reported expenditures, the contribution of YOBG funds was greatest for placements (77.6%) and smallest for Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities (50.9%). Overall, these results indicate that for every \$1 in YOBG funds spent by counties, an additional \$.40 was spent from other funding sources (\$.034 from JJCPA; \$.363 from other sources).¹²

Table 3 – Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and other Funding Sources

Expenditure Type	YOBG Expenditures		JJCPA Expenditures		Other Expenditures		Total Expenditures
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount
Placements	\$62,944,571	77.6%	\$447,324	0.6%	\$17,737,532	21.9%	\$81,129,427
Direct Services	\$20,918,716	60.7%	\$2,499,616	7.2%	\$11,064,124	32.1%	\$34,482,456
Cap Bldg/Maint	\$2,706,786	50.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$2,608,008	49.1%	\$5,314,794
Total	\$86,570,073	71.6%	\$2,946,940	2.4%	\$31,409,664	26.0%	\$120,926,677

¹¹ Only 12 counties utilized YOBG funds for administrative overhead costs.

¹² See Appendix D for breakdowns of per capita costs for each Expenditure Category for all funding sources and for YOBG expenditures only.

Summary of Performance Outcome Data Collection Procedures and Results

Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample

Pursuant to direction received from the Executive Steering Committee, CSA staff worked with the Department of Justice (DOJ) to extract a random sample of 1,100 juveniles with sustained felony offenses between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009 from its Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). Juveniles with sustained felonies were selected based on the presumption that these youth reasonably approximate the types of juveniles who would have been likely candidates for DJJ commitment prior to SB 81. Those with sustained felonies during this time period were selected so that services and outcomes data could be collected for the one-year period following the disposition date for the sustained felony for each juvenile, and with the intention of following the same methodology in future years to permit year-to-year comparisons.¹³

The number of cases sampled from each county was based on the percent of total YOBG funds received by each county, with a minimum of one case selected from each county. Within counties, sampling was done randomly within each gender group. Alpine, Mono and Sierra counties did not have any felony adjudicated youth during 2008-09 and therefore did not report any youth for this reporting cycle. Del Norte County did not participate in JCPSS during the time period from which the sample was drawn so an alternative process was used in which Del Norte County informed CSA of all youth who had sustained felony adjudications during fiscal year 2008-09 and CSA randomly selected one of these cases.

For Plumas, Siskiyou and Nevada counties, alternate cases had to be obtained from JCPSS. Each of these counties were given cases upon which to report based on the initial data set provided by DOJ. However, when the counties tried to complete their reports they found these cases were invalid in some way.¹⁴ All alternate cases were selected using a random sampling process.

Using these procedures, the total number of cases in the Target Sample was 1,088.

¹³ For example, for purposes of reporting outcomes to the Legislature next year, a sample of juveniles with sustained felonies during the 2009-10 fiscal year will be selected.

¹⁴Plumas County's first case was a misdemeanor rather than a felony. A second case also turned out to be a misdemeanor. Plumas ultimately reported on the third case provided. For Siskiyou County, the case originally provided had been entered into JCPSS incorrectly, resulting in an offense adjudication date that was outside of the acceptable date range. They were provided a second case, upon which they reported. Finally, Nevada County was provided two cases upon which to report; however, both cases had been immediately transferred out of the County's jurisdiction following adjudication so no outcome data were available. Two new cases were selected for Nevada and they reported on those two cases.

Assembling the Final Sample

A total of 77 cases were excluded from the Target Sample to arrive at the Final Sample. The reasons for exclusion are shown in Table 4, with by far the greatest number of cases excluded because of errors contained in the JCPSS database with respect to felony adjudication date, with the correct adjudication date for 25 cases preceding the date of enactment of SB 81. Exclusion of these 77 cases resulted in a Final Sample of 1,011 cases. A listing by county showing YOBG allocation amounts as well as the number of cases in the Target Sample and Final Sample is provided in Appendix E.

Table 4 – Cases Excluded from Initial Target Sample

Reason for Exclusion	Number of Cases	Percent of Total Exclusions
Pre-SB 81 Adjudicated Offense	25	32.5%
Sealed Record	16	20.8%
Non Felony Adjudicated Offense	12	15.6%
Duplicate Case	8	10.4%
Minor Found Unfit for Trial	7	9.1%
Invalid ID (not in County Records)	3	3.9%
Post-Dispo. Services Received Outside County	2	2.6%
Undocumented Minor	1	1.3%
Transferred Pre –Dispo. to Another County	1	1.3%
Unfit and Charges Dropped	1	1.3%
2010 Adjudicated Offense Date	1	1.3%
Total	77	

Characteristics of Final Sample

Table 5 compares the age and other demographic characteristics of the Final Sample with those of the Study Population (i.e., all juveniles in the JCPSS database with felony adjudications between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009). Inspection of the table shows that the Final Sample is highly similar to the Study Population.

Table 5 – Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample

Characteristic		Study Population (24,789)	Final Sample (1,011)
Mean Age (on date of adjudication)		15.9	15.8
Gender	Female	12.1%	11.4%
	Male	87.9%	88.6%
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian	0.3%	0.4%
	Asian Indian	0.0%	0.1%
	Black	26.2%	24.5%
	Cambodian	0.1%	0.2%
	Chinese	0.2%	0.2%
	Filipino	0.4%	0.5%
	Guamanian	0.0%	0.1%
	Hawaiian	0.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic	54.3%	53.5%
	Japanese	0.0%	0.0%
	Korean	0.0%	0.0%
	Laotian	0.1%	0.3%
	Other	1.6%	2.5%
	Other Asian	0.9%	1.1%
	Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.3%
	Samoan	0.2%	0.3%
	Unknown	0.4%	0.0%
	Vietnamese	0.4%	0.2%
	White	14.4%	15.8%

Development and Field Testing of Data Collection Instrument

Performance Outcome data was collected via electronic files formatted in Excel. Per the decisions of the ESC, in addition to collecting information on selected outcomes, data was also collected for over 40 different types of direct services (including assessments) and placements. For each such applicable item, information was collected on all source(s) of funding (YOBG, JJCPA, and Other funds). Baseline data was also collected on each juvenile as of the date of adjudication (enrolled in school, case plan in place, employed, etc.). As mentioned previously, all services and outcome data was collected with reference to the one-year period following each juvenile's adjudicated felony disposition date. A copy of the final data collection instrument is provided in Appendix B. Prior to statewide use, the instrument was field tested in Humboldt, Los Angeles, Marin, and Stanislaus counties.

Data Verification

All data received from the counties was subjected to a series of data checking procedures to identify missing or conflicting responses. Counties were alerted to all such items and worked with CSA staff and all but a small handful were resolved.

Results

YOBG-Funded Services

Counties reported providing one or more YOBG-funded services to 334 of the 1,011 youth sampled (33%). Alternatively, counties reported that 667 of the sample youth did not receive any YOBG-funded services. The average number of both direct services and placements was significantly greater for the first group, i.e., those youth who benefited from some YOBG funding. Specifically, YOBG funded youth received an average of 12.03 direct services, compared with 9.19 for non YOBG funded youth. Similarly, YOBG funded youth received an average of 2.07 placements, compared with 1.94 for non YOBG funded youth.

The percentage of cases in each group who received each of five specific types of Assessments during the one-year period from date of adjudication is shown in Table 6. As in all subsequent tables, statistically significant differences are presented in bold and italics.¹⁵ In every instance, the percentage of youth who received a given type of assessment was significantly higher for those youth who benefited from some form of YOBG funding.

Table 6 – Assessment Rates

Type of Assessment	YOBG-Funded Youth (334)	Non YOBG-Funded Youth (667)
<i>Detention Assessment</i>	<i>78.4%</i>	<i>58.1%</i>
<i>Risk/Needs Assessment</i>	<i>91.9%</i>	<i>80.4%</i>
<i>Educational Assessment</i>	<i>72.2%</i>	<i>59.5%</i>
<i>Mental Health Assessment</i>	<i>73.1%</i>	<i>54.2%</i>
<i>Substance Abuse Screening</i>	<i>76.3%</i>	<i>62.0%</i>

Table 7 shows the rates with which the two groups received various types of Placements and Direct Services. Within each category, the specific types are ordered from highest to lowest rate for the YOBG-funded group. Again, all statistically significant results are shown in bold and italics. Additional information regarding the number and percentage of youth receiving assessments, placements and direct services can be found in Appendix F.

Results in Table 7 pertaining to Placements reveal that YOBG-funded youth more often spent time in Juvenile Hall, a Ranch, or Other Placement, while non YOBG-funded youth more often were placed in a Private Residential Care Facility. Home on Probation was the most frequent placement type for both groups, and while not statistically significant, a slightly higher percentage of non YOBG-funded youth were reported as having spent some time in a Camp. The results also reflect the fluid nature of the youth during the one-year period from date of adjudication, with many youth in both groups spending time in more than one type of placement during this time period.

¹⁵ As is standard practice, a probability value of .05 or less ($p \leq .05$) was used as the criterion for statistical significance. Chi-Square was the predominant test statistic used to evaluate statistical significance.

Table 7 – Placements and Direct Services Rates

Placement or Direct Service	YOBG-Funded Youth (334)	Non YOBG-Funded Youth (667)
Placements		
Home on Probation	75.4%	77.7%
Juvenile Hall	74.3%	65.7%
Camp	20.4%	24.1%
Other Placement	15.0%	7.2%
Ranch	12.3%	3.4%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab. Facility	5.7%	4.4%
Private Residential Care Facility	4.2%	11.5%
Direct Services		
Development of Case Plan	88.3%	73.6%
Mental Health Screening	67.4%	48.3%
Intensive Probation Supervision	60.5%	31.8%
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	56.9%	36.0%
Gender Specific Programming (Girls)¹⁶	47.2%	24.1%
Restitution	47.0%	34.4%
Group Counseling	46.4%	35.0%
Community Service	45.8%	34.0%
Anger Management Counseling	44.9%	27.9%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	41.6%	41.4%
Recreational Activities	39.5%	43.3%
Pro-Social Skills Training	37.7%	36.0%
Family Counseling	32.0%	23.3%
Life/Independent Skills Training/Education	28.7%	33.7%
Gang Intervention	28.4%	20.8%
Electronic Monitoring	26.9%	20.1%
Day/Evening Treatment Program	25.7%	14.9%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	25.1%	22.6%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	24.9%	7.1%
Gender Specific Programming (Boys)¹⁷	23.2%	17.2%
Job Readiness Training	21.9%	12.6%
Mentoring	21.3%	20.4%
Parenting Education	17.7%	7.4%
Special Education Services	17.7%	11.7%
Vocational Training	17.4%	9.3%
After School Services	15.9%	14.9%
Transitional Living Skills	15.0%	13.7%
Tutoring	12.3%	8.9%
Restorative Justice	9.0%	7.5%
Job Placement	8.7%	8.3%
Functional Family Therapy	7.8%	9.0%
Monetary Incentives	3.3%	5.0%

¹⁶ Among Girls only

¹⁷ Among Boys only

Results for Direct Services, shown in Table 7, indicate that YOBG-funded youth received significantly higher rates of service for 19 of the 32 Direct Services listed, and that in no instance did a greater percentage of non YOBG-funded youth receive a specific service. It is also interesting to note that the rate of Intensive Supervision was almost twice as high for YOBG-funded youth (60.5%) than for non YOBG-funded youth (31.8%).

The results reported in Tables 6 and 7 compare Assessments, Placements and Direct Services rates for YOBG-funded and non YOBG-funded youth, irrespective of whether the individual placement or direct service was funded by YOBG. A related question is among youth who received some YOBG funding, what specific Assessments, Placements and Direct Services were funded, in whole or in part, by YOBG? Table 8 shows the results of analyses that were conducted related to this question. The percentages reported in the middle column of the table refer to the percentage of YOBG-funded youth for whom a specific Placement or Service was funded (in whole or in part) by YOBG. The percentages reported in the far right column reflect the frequency with which YOBG funds were spent for the Placement or Service when that Placement or Service was provided to an individual. For example, as indicated in the middle column of the table, among all youth who received some YOBG-funding, 35.9% received a Juvenile Hall placement that was funded at some level by YOBG. As indicated in the far right column, in those instances where a YOBG-funded youth went to Juvenile Hall, 48.4% of the time YOBG funds paid for some portion of this placement.

Turning to the results for Assessments, the category which most often received YOBG funding was Risk/Needs Assessments (54.8%), and among YOBG-funded youth who received assessments, Risk/Needs Assessments were often funded in some manner by YOBG (64.2%).

The results for Placements show that while slightly over a third of YOBG-funded youth received Juvenile Hall (35.9%) or Home on Probation (35.3%) placements that were funded by YOBG, among all YOBG-funded youth who received these placements, YOBG funds were used for such placements approximately half of the time (48.4% and 46.8%). In contrast, while far fewer YOBG-funded youth received Camp (13.5%) or Ranch (8.4%) placements that were funded by YOBG, among YOBG-funded youth who received these placements, YOBG funds were used for such placements a very high percentage of the time (66.2% and 68.3%).

The results for Direct Services show that irrespective of the frequency with which YOBG-funds were used to pay for a specific service, when the service was provided, YOBG funds were frequently used to help underwrite the costs of the service (as indicated by the percentages in the far right column of the table).

Table 8 – YOBG Funding of Specific Assessments, Placements & Direct Services
(Percent Cases)

Placement or Direct Service	All YOBG-Funded Youth	All YOBG-Funded Youth Who Received Assessment, Placement or Service
Assessments¹⁸		
Risk/Needs Assessment	54.8%	64.2%
Substance Abuse Screening	36.8%	49.6%
Detention Assessment	32.6%	45.8%
Placements		
Juvenile Hall	35.9%	48.4%
Home on Probation	35.3%	46.8%
Camp	13.5%	66.2%
Ranch	8.4%	68.3%
Other Placement	5.4%	36.0%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab. Facility	2.4%	42.1%
Private Residential Care Facility	0.9%	21.4%
Direct Services		
Development of Case Plan	54.2%	61.4%
Mental Health Screening	35.6%	52.9%
Intensive Probation Supervision	33.2%	55.0%
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	31.1%	54.7%
Anger Management Counseling	26.6%	59.3%
Group Counseling	23.7%	51.0%
Pro-Social Skills Training	23.7%	62.7%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	21.3%	51.1%
Recreational Activities	20.7%	52.3%
Community Service	18.9%	41.2%
Family Counseling	17.4%	54.2%
Gang Intervention	16.8%	58.9%
Day/Evening Treatment Program	15.0%	58.1%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	14.7%	59.0%
Mentoring	14.7%	69.0%
Life/Independent Skills Training/Education	13.5%	46.9%
Parenting Education	13.5%	76.3%
Restitution	13.2%	27.8%
Job Readiness Training	13.2%	60.3%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	12.0%	47.6%
Vocational Training	11.4%	65.5%
Transitional Living Skills	8.1%	52.9%
Special Education Services	7.8%	44.1%
After School Services	6.9%	43.4%
Electronic Monitoring	6.3%	23.3%
Functional Family Therapy	6.0%	76.9%
Tutoring	5.4%	43.9%
Job Placement	5.4%	62.1%
Restorative Justice	3.9%	43.3%
Monetary Incentives	0.9%	27.3%

¹⁸ This information was not collected for all categories of Assessments.

Baseline Characteristics

Certain baseline information was collected for each youth in the Final Sample with reference to their status as of the date of adjudication. Results for these status indicators are presented in Table 9, with YOBG-funded youth compared to non YOBG-funded youth, and show some significant differences between the two groups. Specifically, a greater percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school and had a case plan in place on the date of adjudication, and a greater percentage of this group also were taking psychotropic medications and had substance abuse indicated in their file. In contrast, and paradoxically, a significantly higher percentage of non YOBG-funded youth had a mental health diagnosis/symptoms indicated in their file. Without further information, there is no way to account for these differences. Notwithstanding these limitations, it is noteworthy that these results show very high rates of substance abuse and mental health issues among the youthful felony offenders that were studied.

Table 9 – Baseline Characteristics of Final Sample

	YOBG-Funded Youth (334)	Non YOBG- Funded Youth (667)
<i>Enrolled in School</i>	89.5%	82.6%
High School Graduate/GED or Equivalent	6.0%	4.7%
Employed	10.2%	10.6%
<i>Case Plan in Place</i>	82.0%	69.9%
<i>Taking Psychotropic Medications</i>	16.5%	10.5%
<i>Substance Abuse Indicated in File</i>	83.2%	73.9%
<i>Mental Health Diagnosis/Symptoms Indicated in File</i>	32.9%	42.4%
Ever WIC 300 Indicated in File	9.6%	6.2%
Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation	6.9%	4.9%

Performance Outcomes

Information was collected on eight different outcomes related to education and further involvement in the criminal justice system. All outcomes pertain to the one-year period from date of disposition of the adjudicated felony. Results are reported in Table 10, and show that a higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school during the year and received a high school diploma or GED or equivalent during the year. While not quite statistically significant ($p=.07$), a higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were also enrolled in school at the end of the year. With respect to criminal justice outcomes, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were adjudicated in Juvenile Court for a new felony, while a higher percentage of non YOBG-funded youth were convicted in Adult Court for a new felony. No differences were found with respect to commitment rates to DJJ or probation status at the end of the year.

Table 10 – Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period
(Percent Cases)

Outcome	YOBG-Funded Youth (334)	Non YOBG-Funded Youth (667)
Enrolled in School at any Time During Year	95.2%	89.8%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	72.8%	67.1%
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	12.0%	8.1%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	19.8%	12.4%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	1.8%	6.4%
On Probation at End of Year	73.1%	72.1%
Committed to DJJ During Year ¹⁹	1.5%	1.5%

Given the increased emphasis on risk and needs assessments during the past few years, counties have almost all implemented one or more of these tools. That being the case, the data were used to determine whether there was any difference in outcomes for youth who received an assessment compared with those who did not, irrespective of whether they received YOBG funding. These data show a statistically significant difference for only two outcomes: school enrollment and receipt of a new felony adjudication. For this sample of youth, among those who received a risk and/or needs assessment during the year, 94% were enrolled in school during that year. Of those who did not receive an assessment, 80.3% were enrolled in school. Similarly, of those who received an assessment, 16.7% received a new felony adjudication through the juvenile court process, while only 5.8% of those who did not receive an assessment received a new felony adjudication. These results are illustrated in Table 11. While it does not seem surprising that the administration of risk and/or needs assessments would correspond to higher school enrollment, it is unclear why they would positively correlate to higher rates of adjudication.

Table 11 – Outcomes and Risk/Needs Assessment Rates

Outcome	Received Risk/Needs Assessment During the Year	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in school during the year	94.0%	80.3%
Graduated/earned GED	10.1%	5.1%
New felony adjudication	16.7%	5.8%
New felony conviction	4.8%	4.4%

Additional analyses were conducted to examine whether performance outcome differences for the outcomes of high school graduation/GED, new felony adjudications (Juvenile Court), and new felony convictions (Adult Court) were associated with differences at baseline reported in Table 9. Results of these analyses are shown in Table 12. Table entries are the percentages of cases among both YOBG and non YOBG-funded youth who achieved each outcome within each baseline characteristic

¹⁹ Excludes 13 cases committed to DJJ upon disposition of original adjudicated felony.

subgroup. For example, as reported in the table, among those who were enrolled in school on the date of adjudication, 9.8% graduated or achieved their GED during the year; whereas for those who were not enrolled in school on the date of adjudication, 7.2% graduated or received their GED (a non-significant difference).

As reported in Table 12, high school graduation/GED was not significantly related to any of the YOBG/non YOBG-funded group differences at baseline (recall that a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth graduated or received their GED or equivalent). Differences in felony adjudication rates (Juvenile Court) were found to be associated with one baseline group difference – substance abuse as indicated in the case file on date of adjudication. Not surprisingly, a higher percentage of those with such a file entry received a new felony adjudication (17.0% versus 7.7%). Recall that while significantly more YOBG-funded youth had a new felony adjudication in Juvenile Court (Table 10: 19.8% versus 12.4% for non YOBG-funded youth), a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth also had substance abuse indicated in their file on the date of adjudication (Table 9; 83.2% versus 73.9% for non YOBG-funded youth). A higher felony conviction rate was also found to be associated with school enrollment on the date of adjudication (4.0% for those enrolled and 9.8% for those not enrolled), and it is also true that significantly more YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school on the date of adjudication (Table 9: 89.5% versus 82.6% for non YOBG-funded youth), and significantly more non-YOBG funded youth had a new felony conviction (Table 10: 6.4% versus 1.8% for YOBG-funded youth).

Overall, while these results indicate no associations between baseline group differences and the higher school achievement rate of YOBG-funded youth (as measured by high school graduation or attainment of GED or equivalent), a far clearer picture emerges as to the possible influences of baseline differences on the YOBG-funded/non YOBG-funded group differences found for new felony adjudication and conviction rates. Further study of these possible influences will be conducted as additional research data become available in subsequent years.

Table 12 – Performance Outcomes Relationships with Baseline Characteristics

Performance Outcome (One Year Follow-Up Period)	Baseline Characteristic	
	Enrolled in School on Date of Adjudication	
	Yes	No
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	9.8%	7.2%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	15.6%	10.5%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.0%	9.8%
	Case Plan in Place on Date of Adjudication	
	Yes	No
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	8.7%	11.4%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	15.5%	12.9%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.8%	4.9%
	Taking Psychotropic Medications Indicated in File	
	Yes	No
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	9.5%	9.4%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	18.3%	14.4%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.8%	4.9%
	Substance Abuse Indicated in File	
	Yes	No
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	9.4%	9.4%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	17.0%	7.7%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	5.4%	3.0%
	Mental Health Diagnosis/Symptoms Indicated in File	
	Yes	No
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	8.3%	10.1%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	16.1%	14.0%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.5%	5.0%

Analyses were also conducted to examine whether outcomes were associated with “dosage effects” with respect to the number of direct services received during the year. Results of these analyses, which include all youth irrespective of whether they received YOBG funding, are presented in Table 13. The results show that enrollment status in school, both during and at the end of the year; receiving a new felony adjudication (Juvenile Court); and being on probation at the end of the year were all significantly related to the number of direct services received. That is, the more services received, the more likely the youth maintained involvement in school and in the juvenile justice system.

Table 13 – Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services

Outcome	Number of Direct Services			
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
<i>Enrolled in School at any Time During Year</i>	88.1%	93.4%	96.0%	97.9%
<i>Enrolled in School at End of Year</i>	58.2%	69.5%	74.6%	80.0%
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	11.9%	7.8%	10.7%	9.7%
<i>New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)</i>	9.3%	12.7%	20.5%	20.0%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	6.2%	4.3%	4.0%	4.6%
<i>On Probation at End of Year</i>	62.9%	73.8%	79.0%	81.5%
Committed to DJJ During Year	2.1%	1.4%	.4%	2.1%

Summary

Counties provided detailed information for a representative statewide sample of 1,011 youth with sustained felony adjudications during the 2008-09 fiscal year. Among this group, approximately one-third (334) were the beneficiary of YOBG funding during the one-year period from the date of their adjudication. YOBG-funded youth received significantly more Assessments, Placements and Direct Services than those who did not receive YOBG funding. Further, in most instances, the majority of individual Assessments, Placements and Direct Services received by this group were funded in whole or in part by YOBG. During the one-year period from disposition of their adjudicated felony, YOBG-funded youth also achieved significantly better outcomes with respect to involvement and achievement in school, and while they also received significantly more new felony adjudications in Juvenile Court, they had significantly fewer felony convictions in Adult Court. For all youth, the number of Direct Services was found to be associated with continued involvement in school and on probation, and was also found to be associated with a new sustained felony in Juvenile Court. No significant relationships were found between the number of Direct Services and educational achievement, felony convictions in Adult Court, or commitment to DJJ.

Reporting Requirements for CSA

Along with the increased responsibility for counties, SBX4 13 introduced a new reporting requirement on CSA as well. Previously, there was no requirement that CSA produce YOBG-related reports or post information on its website. With the enactment of SBX4 13, CSA must “prepare and submit to the Legislature a report summarizing county utilizations of block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including a summary of the performance outcomes reported by counties for the preceding fiscal year.” This report is due to the Legislature by March 15th of each year. SBX4 13 also requires that CSA “prepare and make available to the public on its Internet Web site summaries of the annual county reports submitted in accordance with [the YOBG statute].” There is no specific date requirement for the website posting.

Consistent with statutory reporting requirements and direction from the ESC, CSA will be preparing and submitting a report on YOBG expenditures and outcomes each year. In future years, along with a similar presentation of data as provided in this report, it will be possible to provide a year-to-year comparison.

Welfare & Institutions Code:

1950. The purpose of this chapter is to enhance the capacity of local communities to implement an effective continuum of response to juvenile crime and delinquency.

1951. (a) There is hereby established the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund.

(b) Allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject to Sections 731.1, 733, 1766, and 1767.35. Counties, in expending the Youthful Offender Block Grant allocation, shall provide all necessary services related to the custody and parole of the offenders.

(c) The county of commitment is relieved of obligation for any payment to the state pursuant to Section 912, 912.1, or 912.5 for each offender who is not committed to the custody of the state solely pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 733, and for each offender who is supervised by the county of commitment pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1766 or subdivision (b) of Section 1767.35.

1952. For the 2007-08 fiscal year, all of the following shall apply:

(a) An amount equal to the total of all of the following shall be transferred from the General Fund to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund:

(1) One hundred seventeen thousand dollars (\$117,000) per ward multiplied by the average daily population (ADP) for the year for wards who are not committed to the custody of the state pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 733, and Sections 731.1 and 1767.35.

(2) Fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) per parolee multiplied by the ADP for the year for parolees who are supervised by the county of commitment pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1766.

(3) An amount equal to 5 percent of the total of paragraphs (1) and (2). This amount shall be reserved by the Controller for distribution by the Department of Finance, upon recommendation of the Corrections Standards Authority, in collaboration with the Division of Juvenile Facilities, for unforeseen circumstances associated with the implementation of the act that added this chapter. This amount is a one-time allocation and shall not be built into the base described in subdivision (a) of Section 1953 unless the Department of Finance finds a continuation of unforeseen circumstances. A county that wishes to seek funds from this reserved amount shall submit a request to the Corrections Standards Authority that outlines the unusual circumstances that exist in the county and why the county's Youthful Offender Block Grant is inadequate to meet the county financial needs to accommodate and supervise youthful offenders pursuant to the act that added this chapter. The Corrections Standards Authority shall submit its recommendation to the Department of Finance for approval.

(b) Any portion of the funds described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) that is unused during the 2007-08 fiscal year shall revert to the General Fund.

1953. For the 2008-09 fiscal year, the total of the following amounts shall be transferred from the General Fund to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund:

(a) The amount transferred to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund for the 2007-08 fiscal year, as described in subdivision (a) of Section 1952, adjusted to account for full-year impacts.

(b) One hundred seventeen thousand dollars (\$117,000) per ward multiplied by the ADP for the year for wards who are not committed to the custody of the state pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 733, and Sections 731.1 and 1767.35.

(c) Fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) per parolee multiplied by the ADP for the year for parolees who are supervised by the county of commitment pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1766.

1953.5. For the 2009-10 fiscal year, the total of the following amounts shall be transferred from the General Fund to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund:

(a) The amount transferred to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund for the 2008-09 fiscal year, as described in subdivision (a) of Section 1952, adjusted to account for full-year impacts.

(b) One hundred seventeen thousand dollars (\$117,000) per ward multiplied by the ADP for the year for wards who are not committed to the custody of the state pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 733, and Sections 731.1 and 1767.35.

(c) Fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) per parolee multiplied by the ADP for the year for parolees who are supervised by the county of commitment pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1766.

1954. For the 2010-11 fiscal year, and each year thereafter, an amount shall be transferred from the General Fund to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund equal to that amount transferred to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund for the 2009-10 fiscal year, as described in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of Section 1953.5, adjusted to account for full-year impacts.

1954.1. For each fiscal year, the Director of Finance shall determine the total amount of the Youthful Offender Block Grant and the allocation for each county, pursuant to Sections 1955 and 1956, and shall report those findings to the Controller. The Controller shall make an allocation from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund to each county in accordance with the report.

1955. (a) The allocation amount for each county from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund for offenders subject to Sections 733, 1766, and 1767.35 shall be allocated in four equal installments, to be paid in September, December, March, and June of each fiscal year, as follows:

(1) Fifty percent based on the number of the county's juvenile felony court dispositions, according to the most recent data compiled by the Department of Justice, calculated as a percentage of the state total.

(2) Fifty percent based on the county's population of minors from 10 to 17 years of age, inclusive, according to the most recent data published by the Department of Finance, calculated as a percentage of the state total.

(b) Each county shall receive a minimum block grant allocation of fifty-eight thousand five hundred dollars (\$58,500) for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and a minimum block grant allocation of one hundred seventeen thousand dollars (\$117,000) for each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) Commencing with the 2008-09 fiscal year, allocations shall be available to counties that have met the requirements of Section 1961.

1956. The allocation for any eligible county from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund for offenders subject to Section 731.1 shall be determined by the Department of

Finance, consistent with the ADP methodology and fiscal parameters used in Sections 1952, 1953, and 1953.5, for the corresponding fiscal year.

1960. The Legislature finds and declares that local youthful offender justice programs, including both custodial and noncustodial corrective services, are better suited to provide rehabilitative services for certain youthful offenders than state-operated facilities. Local communities are better able than the state to provide these offenders with the programs they require, in closer proximity to their families and communities, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(a) Implementing risk and needs assessment tools and evaluations to assist in the identification of appropriate youthful offender dispositions and reentry plans.

(b) Placements in secure and semisecure youthful offender rehabilitative facilities and in private residential care programs, with or without foster care waivers, supporting specialized programs for youthful offenders.

(c) Nonresidential dispositions such as day or evening treatment programs, community service, restitution, and drug-alcohol and other counseling programs based on an offender's assessed risks and needs.

(d) House arrest, electronic monitoring, and intensive probation supervision programs.

(e) Reentry and aftercare programs based on individual aftercare plans for each offender who is released from a public or private placement or confinement facility.

(f) Capacity building strategies to upgrade the training and qualifications of juvenile justice and probation personnel serving the juvenile justice caseload.

(g) Regional program and placement networks, including direct brokering and placement locating networks to facilitate out-of-county dispositions for counties lacking programs or facilities.

1960.5. (a) The State Commission on Juvenile Justice, pursuant to Section 1798.5, shall develop a Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. On or before January 1, 2009, the commission shall develop and make available for implementation by the counties the following strategies:

(1) Risk and needs assessment tools to evaluate the programming and security needs of all youthful offenders and at-risk youth.

(2) Juvenile justice universal data collection elements, which shall be common to all counties.

(3) Criteria and strategies to promote a continuum of evidence-based responses to youthful offenders.

(b) In drafting the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan, the commission shall take into consideration both of the following:

(1) Evidence-based programs and risk and needs assessment tools currently in use by the counties.

(2) The costs of implementing these strategies.

(c) On or before May 1, 2008, the commission shall provide an interim report to the Legislature, which shall include the status of the work of the commission and the strategies it has identified to date.

1961. (a) On or before May 1 of each year, each county shall prepare and submit to the Corrections Standards Authority for approval a Juvenile Justice Development Plan on its proposed expenditures for the next fiscal year from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund described in Section 1951. The plan shall include all of the following:

(1) A description of the programs, placements, services, or strategies to be funded by the block grant allocation pursuant to this chapter, including, but not limited to, the programs, tools, and strategies outlined in Section 1960.

(2) The proposed expenditures of block grant funds for each program, placement, service, strategy, or for any other item, activity, or operation.

(3) A description of how the plan relates to or supports the county's overall strategy for dealing with youthful offenders who have not committed an offense described in subdivision (b) of Section 707, and who are no longer eligible for commitment to the Division of Juvenile Facilities under Section 733 as of September 1, 2007.

(4) A description of any regional agreements or arrangements to be supported by the block grant allocation pursuant to this chapter.

(5) A description of how the programs, placements, services, or strategies identified in the plan coordinate with programs under Chapter 353 of the Statutes of 2000 (AB 1913).

(b) The plan described in subdivision (a) shall be submitted in a format developed and provided by the Corrections Standards Authority. The Corrections Standards Authority may develop and provide a dual format for counties for the submission together of the county Juvenile Justice Development Plan described in subdivision (a) and the county multiagency juvenile justice plan described in paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 30061 of the Government Code. A county may elect to submit both plans using the dual format and under guidelines established by the Corrections Standards Authority.

(c) Each county receiving an allocation from the Youthful Offender Block Grant fund described in Section 1951 shall, by October 1 of each year, submit an annual report to the Corrections Standards Authority on its utilization of the block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year. The report shall be in a format specified by the authority and shall include all of the following:

(1) A description of the programs, placements, services, and strategies supported by block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, and an accounting of all of the county's expenditures of block grant funds for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) Performance outcomes for the programs, placements, services, and strategies supported by block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including, at a minimum, the following:

(A) The number of youth served including their characteristics as to offense, age, gender, race, and ethnicity.

(B) As relevant to the program, placement, service, or strategy, the rate of successful completion by youth.

(C) For any program or placement supported by block grant funds, the arrest, rearrest, incarceration, and probation violation rates of youth in any program or placement.

(D) Quantification of the annual per capita cost of the program, placement, strategy, or activity.

(d) The authority shall prepare and make available to the public on its Internet Web site summaries of the annual county reports submitted in accordance with subdivision (c). By March 15 of each year, the authority also shall prepare and submit to the Legislature a report summarizing county utilizations of block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including a summary of the performance outcomes reported by counties for the preceding fiscal year.

(e) The authority may modify the performance outcome measures specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) if it determines that counties are substantially unable to provide the information necessary to support the measures specified. Prior to making that modification, the authority shall consult with affected county and state juvenile justice stakeholders. In the event that any adjustment of the performance outcome

measures is made, the outcome measures shall, to the extent feasible, remain consistent with the performance outcome measures specified in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 30061 of the Government Code for programs receiving juvenile justice grants from the Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund.

1962. (a) The Corrections Standards Authority, in consultation with the Division of Juvenile Facilities, may provide technical assistance to counties, including, but not limited to, regional workshops, prior to issuing any Request for Proposal.

(b) The Corrections Standards Authority may monitor and inspect any programs or facilities supported by block grant funds allocated pursuant to this chapter and may enforce violations of grant requirements with suspensions or cancellations of grant funds.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER BLOCK GRANT (YOBG) PERFORMANCE OUTCOME REPORT

Contact Name: William Brown
 Contact Phone: 999-999-9999
 Contact Email: WriteMe@work.com

Section 1 - IDENTIFYING INFORMATION			
Access the JCPSS system and use the Personal Identification Number provided to identify each youth. For purposes of reviewing local records to obtain the information requested you may enter the name of each youth in the spaces provided. However, REMOVE ALL NAMES PRIOR TO RETURNING THE COMPLETED FORM TO CSA.		County ID	99
		Personal Identification Number	866
		Last Name	WriteMe
		First Name	WriteMe
		Adjudicated Offense (Penal Code Section)	PC0001
		Date of Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/22/2009
		Gender (1=Male, 2=Female)	1
		Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)	1/1/1994
		Race/Ethnicity (see codes below)	17
1=American Indian	4=Cambodian	7=Guamanian	10=Japanese
2=Asian Indian	5=Chinese	8=Hawaiian	11=Korean
3=Black	6=Filipino	9=Hispanic	12=Latian
			13=Other Asian
			14=Pacific Islander
			15=Samoa
			16=Vietnamese
			17=White
			18=Other
Section 2 - CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH AT THE TIME OF ADJUDICATION			
Respond to all items in this section with reference to the DATE OF ADJUDICATION shown to the right. Do not leave any spaces blank.		Date of Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/22/2009
		Was the Youth Enrolled in School? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
		Had the Youth Graduated from High School or Achieved a GED or Equivalent? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2
		Was the Youth Employed? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2
		Was a Case Plan in Place for the Youth? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
		Was Substance Use/Abuse Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
		Was a Mental Health Diagnosis or were Mental Health Symptoms Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
		Was the Youth Taking Prescription Psychotropic Medication(s) Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2
		Had the Youth Ever Been Declared a Dependent Under Child Welfare Services Section 3007? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
		Had the Youth Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	3
Section 3 - DISPOSITION AND SERVICES RECEIVED DURING ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION			
Complete all items in this section (Section 3) even if the youth received no YOBG-funded services DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION. Do not leave any spaces blank.		Date of Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/22/2009
		Did the Youth Receive any YOBG Funded Services (Direct or Indirect) During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
		Did the Youth Receive a Detention Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
		Did the Youth Receive a Risk and/or Needs Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
		Did the Youth Receive an Educational Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2
		Did the Youth Receive a Mental Health Screening During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2
		Did the Youth Receive a Substance Abuse Screening During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1
Nature of Disposition			
Listed to the right are disposition (placement) alternatives. Use the codes below to indicate the source of funding for each type of placement that applied to the youth DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION. Enter a single code for each type of disposition. Do not leave any spaces blank.		Juvenile Hall	6
		Ranch	1
		Camp	1
		Other Secure/Semi Secure Rehab Facility	1
		Private Residential Care Facility	3
		Home on Probation	1
		Other Placement	1
		Alcohol/Drug Treatment	2
		After School Services	1
		Aggression Replacement Therapy	1
		Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	1
		Development of Case Plan	1
		Community Service	1
		Day or Evening Treatment Program	1
		Detention Assessment(s)	1
		Electronic Monitoring	6
		Family Counseling	1
		Functional Family Therapy	1
		Gang Intervention	1
		Gender Specific Programming for Girls	1
		Gender Specific Programming for Boys	1
		Group Counseling	3
		Intensive Probation Supervision	1
		Job Placement	1
		Job Readiness Training	1
		Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	1
		Individual Mental Health Counseling	1
		Mental Health Screening	1
		Mentoring	1
		Monetary Incentives	1
		Parenting Education	1
		Pro-Social Skills Training	1
		Recreational Activities	1
		Restorative Justice	1
		Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	1
		Restitution	1
		Risk and/or Needs Assessment	1
		Special Education Services	1
		Substance Abuse Screening	1
		Transitional Living Services and/or Placement	1
		Tutoring	5
		Vocational Training	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
		Other (enter funding code only)	1
Section 4 - PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES			
Your responses to all questions in this section should reflect the behavior of the youth DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF DISPOSITION for the adjudicated felony offense that was identified for the youth. Enter the date of disposition in the space provided. Complete all other items with respect to the one year period from this date. Do not leave any spaces blank.		Date of Disposition for Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/15/2009
		Was the Youth Enrolled in School AT ANY TIME During the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
		Was the youth enrolled in school AT THE END of the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
		Did the Youth Graduate from High School or Achieve a GED or Equivalent DURING the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
		Did the Youth Receive a new Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court) During the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
		Did the Youth Receive a new Felony Conviction (Adult Court) During the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
		Was the Youth on Active Probation DURING the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
		Was the Youth on Active Probation AT THE END of the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=N/A)	1
		Was the Youth Committed to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) AT ANY TIME during the One Year Period Following this Date? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=N/A)	3

Total Expenditures for Each Category (All Funding Sources)

Expenditure Category	Total Expenditures (All Funds)	Statewide Total Per Capita Cost (All Funds)
Juvenile Hall	\$8,716,670	\$7,646
Ranch	\$11,127,368	\$27,140
Camp	\$32,019,226	\$17,224
Other Secure	\$7,986,191	\$9,811
Home on Probation	\$9,842,100	\$2,677
Other Placement	\$11,437,872	\$17,226
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$979,858	\$1,176
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$148,510	\$807
Anger Management Counseling	\$17,042	\$95
Development of Case Plan	\$260,955	\$1,631
Community Service	\$41,354	\$636
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$3,548,116	\$4,348
Detention Assessment(s)	\$241,490	\$3,136
Electronic Monitoring	\$257,292	\$340
Family Counseling	\$1,001,667	\$10,118
Functional Family Therapy	\$779,992	\$4,699
Gang Intervention	\$314,422	\$5,615
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	\$192,596	\$690
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	\$53,222	\$239
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$8,356,848	\$3,540
Job Readiness Training	\$318,780	\$9,962
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng/Educ.	\$32,742	\$62
Individual Mental Health Counseling	\$4,470,450	\$2,899
Mental Health Screening	\$10,200	\$59
Mentoring	\$398,251	\$1,981
Parenting Education	\$2,987	\$36
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$80,040	\$278
Recreational Activities	\$165,042	\$315
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$3,369,204	\$4,342
Restorative Justice	\$63,737	\$2,125
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$3,412,063	\$271
Special Education Services	\$29,997	\$811
Substance Abuse Screening	\$936	\$85
Vocational Training	\$958,403	\$3,896
Other Direct Service	\$4,976,260	\$1,357
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$321,993	\$21,466
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$3,326,807	\$5,920
Capital Improvements	\$310,673	-
Equipment	\$286,378	\$7,159
Contract Services	\$177,009	\$705
Other Procurements	\$398,449	\$1,594
Other	\$493,485	\$247

Appendix D

Summary of Per Capita Costs

Note: Costs shown are those based on total funds (all sources) and YOBB funds only. For each, Statewide Per Capita Cost is based on total costs divided by total youth served for all counties that spent funds in the Expenditure Category. Also shown are the Minimum and Maximum Per Capita Costs at the County level.

Expenditure Category	Counties	All Funds			YOBB Funds		
		Statewide	Min	Max	Statewide	Min	Max
Juvenile Hall	11	\$7,646	\$180	\$31,522	\$6,361	\$178	\$31,522
Ranch	5	\$27,140	\$9,138	\$46,256	\$7,866	\$4,184	\$46,256
Camp	12	\$17,224	\$2,084	\$159,544	\$16,198	\$848	\$112,780
Other Secure	7	\$9,811	\$1,260	\$60,280	\$8,286	\$1,260	\$60,280
Home on Probation	5	\$2,677	\$1,646	\$18,759	\$2,148	\$1,646	\$18,759
Other Placement	3	\$17,226	\$1,849	\$72,305	\$11,619	\$1,849	\$55,808
ALL PLACEMENTS	43	\$9,474	\$180	\$159,544	\$7,351	\$178	\$112,780
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	7	\$1,176	\$33	\$9,726	\$320	\$33	\$1,914
Aggression Replacement Therapy	5	\$807	\$108	\$3,067	\$558	\$12	\$2,670
Anger Management Counseling	2	\$95	\$46	\$264	\$95	\$46	\$264
Development of Case Plan	2	\$1,631	\$1,084	\$2,620	\$1,602	\$1,084	\$2,538
Community Service	2	\$636	\$105	\$2,571	\$329	\$105	\$1,143
Day or Evening Treatment Program	7	\$4,348	\$763	\$8,659	\$3,721	\$201	\$7,214
Detention Assessment(s)	1	\$3,136	\$3,136	\$3,136	\$3,136	\$3,136	\$3,136
Electronic Monitoring	8	\$340	\$35	\$1,808	\$139	\$35	\$479
Family Counseling	2	\$10,118	\$3,333	\$20,556	\$10,118	\$3,333	\$20,556
Functional Family Therapy	3	\$4,699	\$2,039	\$5,659	\$1,113	\$885	\$1,206
Gang Intervention	1	\$5,615	\$5,615	\$5,615	\$1,995	\$1,995	\$1,995
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	4	\$690	\$164	\$4,218	\$690	\$164	\$4,218
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	3	\$239	\$133	\$1,505	\$239	\$133	\$1,505
Intensive Probation Supervision	15	\$3,540	\$885	\$32,029	\$2,553	\$497	\$5,142
Job Readiness Training	1	\$9,962	\$9,962	\$9,962	\$9,962	\$9,962	\$9,962
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	5	\$62	\$2	\$252	\$62	\$2	\$252
Individual Mental Health Counseling	11	\$2,899	\$305	\$6,871	\$620	\$305	\$4,405
Mental Health Screening	4	\$59	\$32	\$1,200	\$59	\$32	\$1,200
Mentoring	5	\$1,981	\$338	\$4,699	\$1,981	\$338	\$4,699
Parenting Education	3	\$36	\$28	\$120	\$36	\$28	\$120
Pro-Social Skills Training	2	\$278	\$14	\$461	\$278	\$14	\$461
Recreational Activities	3	\$315	\$194	\$1,034	\$315	\$194	\$1,034
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	8	\$4,342	\$740	\$9,336	\$2,690	\$740	\$8,523
Restorative Justice	1	\$2,125	\$2,125	\$2,125	\$348	\$348	\$348
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	16	\$271	\$6	\$861	\$120	\$6	\$761
Special Education Services	1	\$811	\$811	\$811	\$811	\$811	\$811
Substance Abuse Screening	1	\$85	\$85	\$85	\$61	\$61	\$61
Vocational Training	3	\$3,896	\$1,139	\$5,015	\$3,779	\$643	\$5,015
Other Direct Service	14	\$1,357	\$64	\$17,613	\$754	\$64	\$17,613
ALL DIRECT SERVICES	140	\$1,278	\$2	\$32,029	\$775	\$2	\$20,556
Staff Training/Professional Development	8	\$21,466	\$68	\$68	\$21,016	\$68	\$68
Staff Salaries/Benefits	11	\$5,920	\$99	\$80,502	\$1,953	\$99	\$10,845
Capital Improvements	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Equipment	7	\$7,159	\$4,122	\$4,375	\$7,121	\$4,074	\$4,375
Contract Services	5	\$705	\$166	\$1,625	\$672	\$166	\$1,625
Other Procurements	2	\$1,594	\$26	\$26	\$487	\$26	\$26
Other	8	\$247	\$80	\$620	\$247	\$80	\$620
ALL CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES	42	\$1,704	\$26	\$80,502	\$868	\$26	\$10,845
ALL CATEGORIES	225	\$3,128	\$2	\$159,544	\$2,239	\$2	\$112,780

Appendix E

Comparison of County YOBG Allocation Amounts and County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group

County	YOBG Allocation		Performance Outcome Study Group			
	Amount	% Total	Original Sample	Exclusions	Final Sample	% Total
Alameda	\$3,149,550	3.4%	37		37	3.7%
Alpine	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Amador	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Butte	\$533,792	0.6%	6		6	0.6%
Calaveras	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Colusa	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Contra Costa	\$2,026,337	2.2%	24		24	2.4%
Del Norte	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
El Dorado	\$411,482	0.4%	5		5	0.5%
Fresno	\$2,602,775	2.8%	31	2	29	2.9%
Glenn	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Humboldt	\$218,186	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Imperial	\$347,715	0.4%	5	1	4	0.4%
Inyo	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Kern	\$3,117,491	3.3%	36		36	3.6%
Kings	\$468,793	0.5%	5		5	0.5%
Lake	\$166,644	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Lassen	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Los Angeles	\$22,008,743	23.6%	260	43	217	21.5%
Madera	\$378,745	0.4%	4		4	0.4%
Marin	\$638,412	0.7%	8		8	0.8%
Mariposa	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Mendocino	\$182,797	0.2%	2	1	1	0.1%
Merced	\$988,330	1.1%	12		12	1.2%
Modoc	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Mono	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Monterey	\$1,053,995	1.1%	12	1	11	1.1%
Napa	\$413,781	0.4%	5		5	0.5%
Nevada	\$220,562	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Orange	\$6,881,391	7.4%	81		81	8.0%
Placer	\$887,233	1.0%	10	1	9	0.9%
Plumas	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Riverside	\$5,839,735	6.3%	69	3	66	6.5%
Sacramento	\$4,355,366	4.7%	51		51	5.0%
San Benito	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
San Bernardino	\$8,223,171	8.8%	97	2	95	9.4%
San Diego	\$7,710,484	8.3%	91	15	76	7.5%
San Francisco	\$1,054,408	1.1%	12		12	1.2%
San Joaquin	\$2,299,765	2.5%	27		27	2.7%
San Luis Obispo	\$462,207	0.5%	6		6	0.6%
San Mateo	\$1,980,175	2.1%	23	3	20	2.0%
Santa Barbara	\$1,086,949	1.2%	13	3	10	1.0%
Santa Clara	\$3,073,403	3.3%	36		36	3.6%
Santa Cruz	\$380,512	0.4%	4		4	0.4%
Shasta	\$379,040	0.4%	5		5	0.5%
Sierra	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Siskiyou	\$124,787	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Solano	\$1,713,712	1.8%	20	1	19	1.9%
Sonoma	\$898,519	1.0%	11		11	1.1%
Stanislaus	\$948,505	1.0%	11		11	1.1%
Sutter	\$287,878	0.3%	3		3	0.3%
Tehama	\$178,372	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Trinity	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Tulare	\$1,048,644	1.1%	12	1	11	1.1%
Tuolumne	\$134,741	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Ventura	\$1,915,583	2.1%	23		23	2.3%
Yolo	\$504,441	0.5%	6		6	0.6%
Yuba	\$212,473	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Total	\$93,264,624	100.0%	1088	77	1011	100.0%

Appendix F

Assessments Administered, Services Provided and Outcomes Achieved

	YOBG-funded Youth (334)		Non YOBG-funded Youth (667)		All Youth (1,011)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Assessments Administered:						
Detention Assessment	262	78.4%	393	58.1%	655	64.8%
Risk/Needs Assessment	307	91.9%	544	80.4%	851	84.2%
Educational Assessment	241	72.2%	403	59.5%	644	63.7%
Mental Health Assessment	244	73.1%	367	54.2%	611	60.4%
Substance Abuse Screening	255	76.3%	420	62.0%	675	66.8%
Services Provided – Placements:						
Juvenile hall	248	74.3%	445	65.7%	693	68.5%
Ranch	41	12.3%	23	3.4%	64	6.3%
Camp	68	20.4%	163	24.1%	231	22.8%
Other secure/semi-secure rehab facility	19	5.7%	30	4.4%	49	4.8%
Private residential care facility	14	4.2%	78	11.5%	92	9.1%
Home on probation	252	75.4%	526	77.7%	778	77.0%
Other placement	50	15.0%	49	7.2%	99	9.8%
Services Provided – Direct Services:						
After School Services	53	15.9%	101	14.9%	154	15.2%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	83	24.9%	48	7.1%	131	13.0%
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	190	56.9%	244	36.0%	434	42.9%
Anger Management Counseling	150	44.9%	189	27.9%	339	33.5%
Development of Case Plan	295	88.3%	498	73.6%	793	78.4%
Community Service	153	45.8%	230	34.0%	383	37.9%
Day/Evening Treatment Program	86	25.7%	101	14.9%	187	18.5%
Electronic Monitoring	90	26.9%	136	20.1%	226	22.4%
Family Counseling	107	32.0%	158	23.3%	265	26.2%
Functional Family Therapy	26	7.8%	61	9.0%	87	8.6%
Gang Intervention	95	28.4%	141	20.8%	236	23.3%
Gender Specific Programming for Girls ¹	17	47.2%	19	24.1%	36	31.3%
Gender Specific Programming for Boys ²	69	23.2%	103	17.2%	172	19.2%
Group Counseling	155	46.4%	237	35.0%	392	38.8%
Intensive Probation Supervision	202	60.5%	215	31.8%	417	41.2%
Job Placement	29	8.7%	56	8.3%	85	8.4%
Job Readiness Training	73	21.9%	85	12.6%	158	15.6%
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng/Ed	96	28.7%	228	33.7%	324	32.0%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	139	41.6%	280	41.4%	419	41.4%
Mental Health Screening	225	67.4%	327	48.3%	552	54.6%
Mentoring	71	21.3%	138	20.4%	209	20.7%
Monetary Incentives	11	3.3%	34	5.0%	45	4.5%
Parenting Education	59	17.7%	50	7.4%	109	10.8%
Pro-Social Skills Training	126	37.7%	224	36.0%	370	36.6%
Recreational Activities	132	39.5%	293	43.3%	425	42.0%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	84	25.1%	153	22.6%	237	23.4%
Restitution	157	47.0%	233	34.4%	390	38.6%
Restorative Justice	30	9.0%	51	7.5%	81	8.0%
Special Education Services	59	17.7%	79	11.7%	138	13.6%
Transitional Living Services	50	15.0%	93	13.7%	143	14.1%
Tutoring	41	12.3%	60	8.9%	101	10.0%
Vocational Training	58	17.4%	63	9.3%	121	12.0%
Outcomes Achieved:						
Enrolled in school during the year	318	95.2%	608	89.8%	926	91.6%
Enrolled in school at the end of the year	243	72.8%	454	67.1%	697	68.9%
Graduated/Earned GED	40	12.0%	55	8.1%	95	9.4%
On active probation during the year	313	93.7%	624	92.2%	937	92.7%
On active probation at end of year	244	73.1%	488	72.1%	732	72.4%
New felony adjudication	66	19.8%	84	12.4%	150	14.8%
New felony conviction	6	1.8%	43	6.4%	49	4.8%
Committed to DJJ ³	5	1.3%	10	1.5%	15	1.5%

¹ The percentages for this category were calculated based on the 115 girls in the sample, 36 of whom received YOBG-funded services and 79 of whom did not.

² The percentages for this category were calculated based on the 896 boys in the sample, 298 of whom received YOBG-funded services and 598 of whom did not.

³ Excludes 13 cases committed to DJJ upon initial disposition of adjudicated felony.

